

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Claudio R. Ballard	Docket No.:	P43312
Serial No:	09/454,492	Group Art Unit:	3693
Filed:	December 6, 1999	Examiner:	Richard C. WEISBERGER
Title:	REMOTE IMAGE CAPTURE WITH CENTRALIZED PROCESSING AND STORAGE		

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Substance of Interview is in response to the telephone interview of August 18, 2009, and to the Interview Summary dated September 11, 2009.

Remarks begin on page 2.

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown by Supervisory Primary Examiner (SPE) James Kramer and Primary Examiner Richard C. Weisberger to Applicant's representatives Abraham HersHKovitz and Ed Garcia-Otero during the telephone interview held on August 18, 2009. Additional substantive related telephone calls were held on July 20, 2009 (including James Kramer, Abraham HersHKovitz, and Ed Garcia-Otero), and on August 19, 2009 (Richard Weisberger and Ed Garcia-Otero).

As a preliminary matter, the Interview Summary appears to refer to all of the above telephone calls.

Applicant appreciates the following items of the Interview Summary (following the numbering scheme of the Interview Summary):

1. the corrections regarding PTO-326;
 2. the clarification of the citation of Prior Art;
 3. the clarification of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection over U.S. 5,559,313;
 4. the clarification of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over U.S. 5,558,313,
 5. the withdrawal of the double patenting rejection based on a terminal disclaimer of record; and
 6. vacating the restriction requirement which was sent in error.
- 7 (second part only). the examiner offered to hold an interview regarding after final amendments, if the applicant deemed such an interview as necessary.

However, Applicant disagrees with the first part of item 7, which asserts that the

Applicant agreed that the finality status of the pending office action was correct.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW FINALITY

Applicant submits that the final Office Action dated July 15, 2009 is not a proper final rejection under 37 CFR § 1.113.

Specifically, Applicant submits that the final Office Action includes a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claim, nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR § 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR § 1.17(c). Thus, the final rejection is not proper according to MPEP 706.07(a).

The final Office Action includes new rejections of independent claim 56 and independent claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for lack of written description. Applicant submits that these new grounds of rejection are not necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims, and are not based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR § 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR § 1.17(c).

Additionally, Applicant submits that the final Office Action dated July 15, 2009 is the first Office Action to substantively examine any claims against prior art (other than with respect to double patenting), and therefore should be non-final.

Further, Applicants submit that prosecution history of this application is extremely unusual and abusive. The first Office Action on the merits was issued on July 2, 2001. Even including that first Office Action, no claim was examined against prior art (other than the parent

application regarding double patenting) until the pending Office Action dated July 15, 2009.

After waiting over 8 years after the first Office Action, the Applicant has still not received an examination of claim 55 against prior art regarding anticipation and obviousness. Applicant asserts that this prosecution history is abusive, and is filled with frivolous restrictions and with an improper requirement under 37 CFR § 1.105.

Thus, Applicant requests that the finality be withdrawn.

REQUEST TO MODIFY THE PERIOD FOR REPLY

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the final Office Action dated July 15, 2009 was so defective that it was impossible for the Applicant to reply. Applicant submits that the corrective Interview Summary dated August 11, 2009 should reset the clock, and should serve as a starting point for calculating the period for reply to the defective final Office Action dated July 15, 2009.

Upon receiving this defective Office Action, Applicant's representatives immediately called Supervisory Primary Examiner (SPE) J. Kramer and left a voice message on July 16, 2009. Applicant has made and received numerous phone calls (July 16, 2009; July 20, 2009; July 24, 2009; July 30, 2009; August 4, 2009; August 5, 2009; August 7, 2009; August 13, 2009; August 18, 2009; August 19, 2009, August 28, 2009; and August 25, 2009) attempting to clarify the defective final Office Action.

These telephone calls included leaving voice messages on August 5, 2009 and August 7, 2009 for Examiner Weisberger. Examiner Weisberger did not respond to these two voice

messages. Applicant then called Supervisory Primary Examiner (SPE) Kramer on August 13, 2009 in order to get a response.

Eventually, an Interview Summary dated September 11, 2009 was written which appears to have corrected many of the defects. Almost 2 months have been spent on this effort to correct defects.

Applicant submits that the time period set for reply to the final Office Action dated July 15, 2009 should be extended by about 2 months, in order to compensate for the 2 months which the Applicant has spent attempting to correct the defective Office Action.

The Interview Summary dated September 11, 2009 should serve as the starting point for the period of reply to the pending Office Action.

CONCLUSION


For the above reasons, Applicant requests that the finality of the final Office Action dated July 15, 2009 be withdrawn. Further, Applicant requests that the period of time for reply be modified, so that the shortened statutory period for reply of 3 months begins on September 11, 2009 (the date of the corrective Interview Summary), and ends on December 11, 2009.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be beneficial in order to place this application in even better condition for examination and allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representatives at the telephone number listed below. Favorable consideration and early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees necessary for consideration of the papers filed herein, to preserve the pendency of this application and refund excess payments to Deposit Account No. 50-2929, referencing Docket Number P43312.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Claudio R. BALLARD

Handwritten signature of Abraham HersHKovitz in black ink.

Abraham HersHKovitz
Reg. No. 45,294

Ed Garcia-Otero
Reg. No. 56,609

September 15, 2009

HERSHKOVITZ & ASSOCIATES, LLC
2845 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
(703) 370-4800
(703) 370-4809 (FAX)

P43312.A10 Substance of Interview AH/EG